

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

# PCT

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**  
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/DK2004/000619

International filing date (day/month/year)  
16.09.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)  
16.09.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
C14B1/58, C14B15/06

Applicant  
MAJGAARD INVEST APS

### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Helpiö, T.

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7495



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY****Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - ☒ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language **English**, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - ☐ a sequence listing
    - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - ☐ in written format
    - ☐ in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
    - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/DK2004/000619

---

**Box No. II Priority**

---

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. ☐ It has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim because a copy of the priority document was not available to the ISA at the time that the search was conducted (Rule 17.1). This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

4. Additional observations, if necessary:

---

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

---

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-49
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-49
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-49
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

**see separate sheet**

---

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

---

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

**see separate sheet**

**Re Item V**

**Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:  
D1: WO 01/62985 A (HEDEGAARD JENS) 30 August 2001 (2001-08-30)  
D2: US-A-3 313 038 (BOLZ ROBERT E) 11 April 1967 (1967-04-11)
- 2 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and discloses (cf. especially page 9, line 16 - page 10, line 30; figures):

"Method for the drying of the leather side of pelts (6) from furred animals, where the pelt is applied and stretched on the outside of a distension element (2) with the leather side facing the peltboard (2), and where the pelt (6) is secured in this position during the drying process by the drawing-on of a holding bag (8) which, at least over a part of the lower end of the pelt (6), presses this against the board (2)".

The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known method in that:

"the distension element is hollow and its surface has an open structure, and the drying of the leather side of the pelt takes place by replacement of the air inside the cavity of the distension element, and herewith the air which exists under the open structure".

The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as providing an improved method for the drying of the leather side of pelts ensuring a more effective replacement of drying air.

The pelt board according to D1 has an essentially closed surface and a solid structure comprising a longitudinal slot opening (16) into which air is introduced via a hose (18). This structure limits the replacement of air between the pelt and the pelt board. Document D2 discloses an open frame for drying pelts. The frame comprises means for blowing drying air inside the pelt when it is stretched on the frame. D2 does not disclose the use of a holding-bag for securing the pelt into its position during drying.

There is no indication in D1 or D2 which would lead the skilled person, in order to solve the above problem, to modify and/or combine their teachings and thereby arrive to the subject-matter of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 appears to satisfy the requirements of Article 33 PCT with regard to novelty and inventive step.

- 3 The subject-matter of the independent claim 3 relates to a system for conducting the method according to claim 1. The drying system comprises a distension element and a drying aggregate interacting with the distension element. The subject-matter of the independent claim 4 relates to a distension element for use in the drying system according to claim 3. The subject-matter of the independent claims 42 and 45 relates to a drying aggregate for use in the drying system according to claim 3. The subject-matter of these independent claims is also considered new and inventive over documents D1 and D2.
- 4 Dependent claims 2, 5-41, 43, 44 and 46-49 add further features to the independent claims and as such they also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

**Re Item VIII**

**Certain observations on the international application**

- 5 Claims 4, 42 and 45 are formulated as if they were dependent claims. These claims, however, do not contain all the features of the claim they refer to, as required by Rule 6.4 (a) and (b) PCT. The scope of protection of these claims is not clear and, as a consequence, the present application does not fulfil the requirements of Article 6 PCT.
- 6 The non-uniform use of terms "distension element" and "pelt board" results in unclarity (Art. 6 PCT) of the claims.

\*\*\*\*\*